



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

ANGLIA. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. IV Band, 2, 3 u. 4 Hefte. Halle, 1881.

II.—According to the new arrangement, Nos. 1 and 3 of the Anglia will contain essays and be edited by Prof. Wülcker, Leipzig; Nos. 2 and 4, book reviews, edited by Prof. Trautmann, Bonn. No. 2 opens with a full bibliography of books and essays in English philology which appeared in the years 1877, '78, '79.

Miss L. T. Smith presents a brief, but appreciative, notice of Prof. Dowden's Southey in the English Men of Letters series.

Wülcker follows with a review of Brother Azarias's Development of English Literature: Old English Period. He examines each chapter separately, and finds much to object to. His judgment of it as a whole is that there is little in it to praise. He considers it "vollständig veraltet," and charges that the latest German works on the subjects of which it treats have been completely neglected. A work on Anglo-Saxon literature cannot afford to neglect ten Brink's Geschichte der Englischen Literatur, I.

F. Kluge notices Zupitza's edition of Aelfric's Grammatik und Glossar, Erste abtheilung, text und varianten; and the second edition of his Alt- und Mittlenglisches Uebungsbuch. He praises both, but takes exception to the quantity of certain words as marked by Zupitza, and thinks that he has not always carried out his own principles consistently.

U. Zernial gives a very favorable review of Körner's Einleitung in das Studium des Angelsächsischen, II teil: Text, übersetzungen, glossar—notwithstanding the philological quarrel to which it has given occasion between Zupitza and Körner. After noticing at some length the extracts, translation, notes and glossary, he thinks that it fulfils its object well, but that the old principle of *ne quid nimis* has not been sufficiently regarded in the notes. He objects to some of the explanations, and gives his own views on these points, but on the whole recommends the book very cheerfully, as indeed it deserves, though I should think it would have been better, in a book intended for students, to dispense with the translation, as the notes and glossary furnish all requisite assistance in the elucidation of the text.

G. Tanger contributes the longest review on The First Quarto Edition of Hamlet, 1603: Two Harness Prize Essays, 1880. I. by C. H. Herford, B. A., and II. by W. H. Widgey, B. A. Tanger regrets that the results of the investigation of the Hamlet-question are as contradictory as ever. In his own studies (Part I published in Anglia IV 211, reported in this Journal, II 386; Parts II and III, in the Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society, June, 1881) he reached the conclusion that Q₂ is very probably printed from the poet's MS., the Folio from the actors' rolls, and Q₁ is pla-

giarized, whereas these two essays agree in regarding Q_1 as a first sketch by Shakspeare based on an original Hamlet (by Kyd, according to Widgery), and Q_2 as a later revision. I cannot follow the reviewer in his lengthy examination of the Essays, but must refer Shakspeare students to the article itself. He does not think that any new difficulties in the way of his theory are presented by these investigations.

A. Schröer notices briefly A. Würzner's Essay on Chaucer's Lyrical Poems, and Dr. John Koch's translations, in the metre of the originals, of Selected Minor Poems of Chaucer. He praises both works, especially the latter, and characterizes the translations as "vortrefflich."

J. Koch supplies corrections to his Selected Minor Poems of Chaucer, and M. Trautmann notices Müller's Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache, zweite Auflage, and Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, Parts I, II and III. Each of these works has its advantages. Müller supplies the literature concerning the derivation of a word, and Skeat treats specially its historical relations. He gives the word *gnaw* as an example from each, and while both works admit of corrections in particulars, he thinks that is no reproach, as only gradually can an etymological dictionary become perfect. He supplies additions to the following words: *burr, catch, catcher, collop, deal, dusk, fag, fudge, lurk, mellow, painim, stark.*

M. Trautmann closes the number with Sievers's Grundzüge der Phonetik, a second edition of his Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie, in the heading, but the ten-page article says little about Sievers's work. It is devoted to an attack upon the vowel-system of Bell and Sweet, which Storm and Sievers follow, and an exposition of Trautmann's own system, with a defence of it vs. Bell's. I have not space here for even a summary of the objections to Bell's system, and of the arguments in favor of his own system which Trautmann presents, but phonetists must read the article. Trautmann should have supplied key-words, so that a layman might determine more readily what sounds some of his diacritics designate; but his system seems much simpler than Bell's, and has a natural basis, the notes of the musical scale. He insists strongly upon the fact that the positions of the mouth *and* the sound determine the vowels, and neither will alone suffice. He says: "Bell's vokalsystem ist ein system, aber ein so wanschaffnes, dass ich nicht begreife, wie es anhängen hat gewinnen können," and, as a consequence, "Der abschnitt, in welchem Sievers die vokale handelt, ist ohne allen wert." Trautmann thinks to justify his views in his forthcoming book, "Die Sprachlaute im Allgemeinen und die Laute des Französischen, Englischen und Deutschen im Besondern." Here we have a very decided opponent of the system of Bell and Sweet, which seemed to be carrying everything before it, so as to convert even Sievers. "It is a very pretty quarrel as it stands," and we can only await further developments.

III.—O. Collman begins the third number with an essay on Alexander Pope and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. He notices their correspondence, their quarrels, and Lord Hervey's attacks on Pope, and gives a more particular examination to the Letter to a Noble Lord, with the object, as it

seems, of réfuting Macaulay's assertion that Pope "lied and equivocated," and Dr. Johnson's that "he was sometimes wanton in his attacks—and mean in his retreat." He thinks this letter shows that Pope did not retreat, but had the last word.

H. Breyman supplies some corrections to L. Proescholdt's Collation of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, having himself examined carefully all the existing quartos, with a view to a new critical edition of the play.

W. Sattler continues his examples of the Use of Prepositions in Modern English with—XII, *free from, free of*; XIII, *by the help, with the help*; XIV, *with a vengeance*.

G. Schleich follows with Beitrage zum Mittlenglischen Roland. He had made this poem the subject of a Berlin doctor-dissertation, and Wissmann, in his recension of it, had combated Schleich's view that the poem belonged to the border between the southern and west-midland counties, assuming an eastern and northern origin for it. Schleich defends his view by comparing the Roland with the Ferumbras and with Trevisa in certain dialectic peculiarities. He had also assigned the copyist to the northeastern border of the midland, which view Herrtage, the editor of the poem, opposed, as also Schleich's implication as to the date of the poem. Schleich furnishes additional arguments for his opinion, and takes exception to Herrtage's explanation of the metre of the poem. The main body of the article is taken up with critical notes on the text of the Roland.

The pièce de résistance of this number is Th. Wissmann's Studien zu King Horn, but I cannot do more than transcribe the titles of the sections of his sixty-page article. Wissmann's views as to the relation of the different forms of the *Hornsage*, i. e. King Horn, Roman de Horn, and Horn Childe, as given in his Untersuchungen zu King Horn, have been criticized by Prof. Stimming in Englische Studien, I 357, so section I, Verhältniss der verschiedenen Fassungen, is devoted to substantiating these views; section II treats the Erziehung des Helden; III, Der Ritterschlag; IV, Bewaffnung. Kampf; V, Rittersitte; VI, Lebensart, Behausung; VII, Die Liebe; VIII, Die Gefährten des Helden; IX, Wunderbares; X, Christen und Heiden; XI, Bettler und Spielleute; XII, Schlusswort, in which Wissmann denies that we have here the original of the various similar sagas which were spread over northern and central Europe in the Middle Ages, but thinks that there was a kernel of genuine saga, how much it is hard to say, which was worked up by different minstrels according to circumstances. The manners and customs of the 12th, or at latest the first half of the 13th century, are delineated in this poem.

R. P. Wülcker has a brief article on Caedmon and Milton, in which he shows from Milton's History of England that Milton could not read Anglo-Saxon, in particular the poem on the battle of Brunanburh, even if by the help of Wheloc's Latin translation and Henry of Huntingdon he could understand the prose-text of the Chronicle. Possibly he might have been made acquainted with Caedmon and his works by Junius, but we have no

evidence of it, and he not even mentions what Beda says of Caedmon. Finally, if he had known Caedmon, he would have been guilty of a falsehood in saying that he will sing

“Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.”

J. Zupitza contributes some critical notes from a collation of the three MSS. (E., J., T.) of the Poema Morale, being reminded of them by the appearance of H. Lewin's edition of the poem.

A. Napier, on Andreas 1182, suggests *ealdorgeard*=*domus vitae, corpus*, for the *eadorgeard* of Grimm and Grein.

Prof. W. W. Skeat and A. Schröer, on the Etymology of ‘Catch,’ defend the derivation from Old French *cachier*, so given in Skeat's, Müller's and Mätzner's dictionaries, as against Trautmann, who assumed (ANGLIA, IV 2, 52) its derivation from a supposed A. S. **ceccan* or **cæcan*.

H. Varnhagen, in Kleine Bemerkungen, Nachträge, Besserungen, gives passages from Early English works illustrating the use of bells on riding-horses.

O. Lohmann supplies Nachträge zu Anglia III 1; and A. Schröer, to Anglia IV 1.

C. Deutschbein contributes an obituary notice of Edward Müller, best known as author of the Etymological Dictionary of the English Language already referred to above, who died on April 7, 1881.

A mutual explanation from Zupitza and Wülcker, consequent upon a remark of Kölbing's, closes this number. It seems that the rivalry between the Englische Studien and the Anglia is anything but generous, as the *odium philologicum* crops out occasionally.

IV.—R. P. Wülcker gives an interesting résumé of the translations of “Beowulf,” in connection with Lumsden's recent translation, noticed in this JOURNAL, II 7, 355. He includes brief notices of Thorkelin's Latin, Grundtvig's and Schaldemose's Danish, Leo's (in part), Ettmüller's, Grein's, Simrock's, Heyne's, and von Wolzogen's German; Sandras's (in part) Latin, and Botkine's French; Kemble's, Thorpe's, and Arnold's prose, Conybeare's (in part), Wackerbarth's and Lumsden's metrical English translations. He mentions also Longfellow's translation of Canto III, about seventy lines, and Klipstein's announcement of an edition with version, which was never published, and says: “Eine vollständige übertragung des Beowulf ist meines wissens in Amerika nicht erscheinen,” which is true, although it is said that the late Prof. S. H. Carpenter prepared such a translation, and the present writer has completed one which may possibly see the light. While Lumsden's translation has a number of manifest errors, Wülcker thinks it is not injured thereby, as it is not written for students of Anglo-Saxon, but for the public, and he considers it a good and readable, though free, translation. He gives short extracts from Ettmüller, Heyne, von Wolzogen—the last in order to criticize it—Botkine, Conybeare, Wackerbarth, and Lumsden. This summary shows plainly the interest of scholars in our Anglo-Saxon epic.

Wülcker states in respect to his edition of Grein's *Bibliothek der A. S. Poesie*, of which the first half of the first volume has appeared, that he will give the accents of *Waldere* and *Beowulf* at the close of the first volume, and of those pieces in that volume not taken from the *Exeter-book*; the accents of the *Exeter-book* will be given at the end of the second volume. An alphabetical list of the accented words in the *Beowulf MS.* is given in this article. I think it a misfortune that Wülcker should have departed from Grein's own practice in respect to the accents, as I fail to see that anything is gained thereby.

Wülcker gives next a report of Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, III band, reported in this *JOURNAL*, II 545. The editorial differences already referred to appear here also. Wülcker notices lastly O. Brenner's German translation of S. Bugge's *Studien über die entstehung der nordischen götter- und heldensagen*, I heft. Bugge's work has excited much interest, as it attributes a great deal of the Edda-mythology to the influence exerted on the Vikings by the Christian schools in England, where Judæo-Christian and Graeco-Roman elements were united. Wülcker eagerly awaits the appearance of the other two parts, so that a judgment of the work as a whole can be formed.

E. Einkenel reviews very favorably H. Lewin's critical edition of the *Middle-English Poema Morale* from the six existing MSS. Apart from a few mistakes which he finds, he thinks the author has accomplished his object, and dismisses the book with his best wishes.

J. Koch contributes the principal review in this number on The latest publications of the Chaucer Society and the transmission of the *Minor Poems*—being Nos. LVIII, LIX, LX and LXI of series I, 1879–80. After some general remarks on the MSS., Koch takes up each of the twenty *Minor Poems* separately and compares the different texts with each other, giving in some cases a scheme of the genealogy of the MSS. In an appendix he classifies the MSS. according to the libraries where each is found, and gives the contents of each.

Miss L. T. Smith gives an interesting summary of the contents of Cassell's *Library of English Literature*, selected, edited, and arranged by Henry Morley, in five volumes, 1876–81. She also notices briefly E. Oswald's *Thomas Carlyle, Ein Lebensbild und Goldkörner aus seinen Werken*, and J. Darmesteter's *Macbeth*, edition classique. From her description this appears to be an excellent edition of the play, carefully annotated, and provided with a valuable introduction to the study of Shakspeare.

M. Trautmann closes this number with a very hurried notice of Storm's *Englische Philologie*, reviewed in this *JOURNAL*, II 484. He regrets that he cannot speak of it as fully as he intended and as it deserves. After some quotations from the introduction, he gives a very brief summary of the contents of each chapter, taking exception, as already mentioned, to Storm's advocacy of Bell's vowel-system, and closes his notice as follows: "Was dem buche fehlt ist ein hinlänglich ausgereifter plan und rechte ordnung

in der verteilung des stoffes: es ist oft ein allzu dünnes und zuweilen kaum zu erkennendes logisches fädchen, was die einzelnen abschnitte zusammenhält. Sieht man jedoch lediglich auf den inhalt, so kann man nicht leicht zu überschwenglich loben."

J. M. GARNETT.

HERMES. 1881.

No. I.

Th. Mommsen. Die Remuslegende (pp. 1-23). The story of Romulus and Remus as it appears in Livy was fully developed as early as 300 B. C., at which time the tradition was fixed by means of coins and works of art. The figure of Remus is of later origin and purely supplementary. Roman rites and religious ceremonies, as well as legendary topography, fail to exhibit distinct traces or mementoes of Remus.

The name Remus in all probability was merely a differentiation of Romulus. The story of the contention between the brothers seems to have arisen in Republican times, and to have been moulded after the type of the two consuls. The element of the *auspicium* in the quarrel is rather dissonant; one and the same point of observation was an essential requisite for auspices referring to the intended founding and locating of one and the same city. Besides, the auspices were never considered the proper means of deciding a question of precedence between colleagues.

The female divinity *Remurina* is probably a personification which arose from the *ager Remurinus*, a hill on the Tiber about four miles from the city. This *ager Remurinus* had no connection whatever with *Remus*. As this spot, however, was a little too far away to fit into the *auspicium* of Romulus, the position of Remus was localized opposite the *Palatinus*, viz. on the *Aventinus*. This version of the story, by the way, seems to have been invented as late as the Augustan period.

Discrepancies between the earlier and later versions in the remaining portion of the legend are glaring enough. According to one version, Remus was slain immediately after the *auspicia*; according to another, the brothers were for a time joint rulers, e. g. Verg. Aen. I 293:

—Remo cum fratre Quirinus

Iura dabunt.

Th. Mommsen. A second fragment of the *Lex Rubria* of the year 705 of Rome. These fragments were found on parts of a plate of bronze which fitted together, in 1880, near Este. Julius Caesar had granted Roman citizenship to the communities of Gallia Transpadana in 705 A. U. = 49 B. C. Consequently the jurisdiction of these new citizens had to be modified so as to conform to their new legal status. This was done by the *Lex Rubria*, of which the present fragment evidently is a part. The fourth table of this *Lex Rubria* was found many years ago at Veleia. Mommsen thinks there can be no reasonable doubt that the fragment before us must be referred to the same law.

L. Roscius Fabatus, who introduced the bill, seems to have acted in the interest or at the order of Caesar: the vote was taken only twenty days before Caesar's arrival in Rome.

Both form and subject-matter being of great interest, we subjoin the text :

[Quei post hanc legem rogatam in eorum quo oppido municipio colonia praefectura foro veico conciliabulo castello territoriove, quae in Gallia cisalpeina sunt eruntve ad I virum II virum praefectumve in iudicium fiduciae aut pro socio aut] mandati aut tutelae, suo nomine quodve ipse earum rerum quid gessisse dicetur, add(u)cetur, aut quod furti, quod ad hominem liberum liberamve pertinere dicatur, aut iniuriarum agatur: sei is, a quo petetur quomve quo agetur, d(e) e(a) r(e) in eo municipio colonia praefectura iudicio certare [volet] et si ea res (sestertium decem milium) minorisve erit, quo minus ibei d(e) e(a) r(e) iudex arbiterve addicatur detur, quove minus ibei d(e) e(a) r(e) iudicium ita feiat, utei de iis rebus, quibus ex h(ac) l(ege) iudicia data erunt, iudicium fieri exerceri oportebit, ex h(ac) l(ege) n(ihilum) r(ogatur). Quoius rei in qu(o)que municipio colonia praefectura quouisque I vir(i) eiusve, qui ibei lege foedere pl(ebi)ve sc(ito) s(enatus)ve c(onsulto) institutove iure dicundo praefuit, ante legem seive illud pl(ebi) sc(itum) est, quod L. Roscius a. d. V eid. Mart. populum plebemve rogavit, quod privatim ambigetur, iuris dict(i)o iudicis arbitri recuperatorum datio addictio[v]e fuit] quantaque rei pequniaeve fuit: eius rei pequn(iaeve) quo magis privato Romae revocatio sit qu[ove mi]nus quei ibei i(ure) d(icundo) p(raerit) d(e) e(a) r(e) ius dicat iudice[m arbitrumve det,] utei ante legem sive illud pl(ebi) sc(itum) est, [quod L. Roscius a. d.] V eidus Mart. populum plebe[mve] rogavit, ab eo quei ibei i(ure) d(icundo) p(raerit) ius di[ci] iu[dicem arbitrumve dari oportuit, ex h(ac) l(ege) n(ihilum) r(ogatur)].

F. Blass adds some supplementary notes to his discussion of the papyrus fragments recently published by him, *Hermes* XV, p. 366 sqq., which now are identified as being derived from Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens.

H. Jordan. *Quaestiones Orthographicae Latinae* IV-V. Jordan notes that *quotannis* is merely the shorthand of *quotquot annis*, as inscriptions prove. *Quot calendis* (= omnibus calendis) occurs in Plautus (Stichus, 60). There was probably no other cause to prevent the establishment of *quot mensibus* as a definite adverb than the phonetic consideration. But what of *quotidie*? The MSS. fluctuate between *cottidie* and *cotidie*, between *cottidianus* and *cotidianus*, whereas they never exhibit the form *quotidie*, *quotidianus*. How then were the latter (the original) forms of the word changed into those above? The metamorphosis occurred just as *cum* (conjunction) was developed from *quom*, and *cur* from *quor* (which J. derives from abl. *quod*). *Quotidie* probably was in vogue down to the times of Cicero, although it was archaic in Quintilian's day (Inst. Ov. I 7, 6). What is the etymology of *classis*? Curtius and Pott derive the word from *κλησις*, Doric *κλῆσις*. This derivation Jordan calls into question: he fails to see how the peculiar sense of the Roman *classis* could have been derived from *καλειν*. Nor does *calare* exhibit the etymology of *classis*. Jordan compares the gloss *κληδός* = *σωδός* (heap, crowd, swarm) in Hesychius, and so = *squadron*, *agmen clausum*, *globus*.

Carl Robert, of Berlin, presents an archaeological communication: *Der Streit der Goetter um Athen*. The author of this paper discusses the subject of a vase-painting now at St. Petersburg, and first published there by Stephani, in 1872. His view of the famous contest between Athena on the one side and

Poseidon on the other differs materially from that of the first editor as well as from that of Petersen and Brunn. Poseidon is making a motion with his trident as if to destroy the sacred olive on the Acropolis, while the sacred serpent wound around the tree poises her head against the assailant; Dionysus is hastening up to ward off the invader, and Athena is getting ready to thrust her lance against her rival. The bearded man seated near by is Cecrops; the nymph present is Pandrosos, the *genius loci*, and the small temple is the Erechtheion. The salt-spring was left as a memento of the struggle on the part of Poseidon, rather than as a gift useful to the community of Athens, and such also is the view to be taken of the olive of Athena. The people of Athens chose their tutelary deity not from utilitarian considerations, but as a matter of free choice and pure affection. This interpretation of the vase-painting—so Robert claims—agrees fully not only with the literary tradition in Herodotus, Polemo, Pausanias, Callimachus, etc., but also with the ancient representation of the same subject on the western front of the Parthenon.

E. Stutzer. *Beitraege zur Erklarung und Kritik des Lysias*, pp. 88-121. Stutzer discusses at great length the ninth, the fourth, and the twenty-seventh speeches of Lysias. He considers the ninth a mere abstract. Great familiarity with Lysianic literature is evinced by the author in the course of his disquisitions, but the article does not admit of condensation.

A. Breysig. *Notes on Avienus*, pp. 122-136.

M. Schanz contributes a communication on the Sources of Vegetius. Vegetius was an epitomator of military science who compiled his work in the fifth century A. D., being a contemporary of Valentinian (425-455 A. D.). Schanz finds that the authorities abstracted and compiled by him were books dating from Cato down to the time of Commodus (—180 A. D.), viz. Cato, Celsus, Frontinus, Paternus.

Vegetius quotes the *Constitutiones* of Augustus Trajan and Hadrian, but not at first hand, as Schanz points out. The reference to the *Constitutio* of Hadrian is evidently drawn from Paternus. Hence Schanz identifies another passage, I 27, as derived from Paternus by Vegetius as well as some others. One of these passages—derived from Paternus according to Schanz—possesses a curious interest. It seems that the soldiers had a kind of savings-bank in each cohort, into which half the donative was put. Each cohort had its special fund, and besides these there was a common burial fund for the benefit of any comrade in the entire legion.

No. II.

W. Dittenberger, (Halle). Critical remarks on some Greek inscriptions.

A few years ago O. Riemann published a few inscriptions from Thyatira, from copies of Cyriacus of Ancona. But inasmuch as Cyriacus added the note 'ex insula *Θειατίρρα*,' Dittenberger observes that probably he meant, not the Lydian town of Thyatira, but the island of Thera. The inscription referred to was read by Cyriacus some 435 years ago, and is published in C. I. G. 6819. The very form *Χαριστίον* which Riemann failed to discover in Stephanus, and therefore proposed to change to *Χαριστίριον*, is found in three distinct inscriptions, one being from Thera and two from Cnidus, hence from *Doric* localities.

Another reading of a Doric inscription by Riemann is emended by Dittenberger. The services of some priest of Anaphê (near Thera) are commended in a decree: τὰν ποθηδρείαν καὶ τὰν ἐπιμέλειαν ἀξίως λείτων θεῶν κατὰ πάντα καιρὸν φαίνεται ποιοῦμενος. This peculiar word *λείτων* Riemann explains as being = *λαίων* (ap. Hesychium = *δημόσιος*); D. simply reads ΑΕΙ ΤΩΝ κτέ.

In another inscription Riemann's reading is ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς ἀπωτάτης (of the most distant) 'Αρτέμιδος—after Cyriacus. D. calls attention to the ease with which Π might have been misread for ΓΙ and thus reads τῆς ἀγιωτάτης.

Another particularly interesting inscription discussed by Dittenberger is one first published by Kumanudis in the 'Αθήναιον VII, p. 207, n. 2. It was brought to Athens and sold to the Archaeological Society there by some dealer. It refers to the sale of sacerdotal positions, an antiquarian matter mentioned only in one passage in extant Greek literature, viz. Dionysius Halic. Antiqq. Rom. I 21. Kumanudis suggested Erythrae, τῆς Αἰολίδος, as the source of the inscription. Apart from the fact that Erythrae is in Ionia and not Aeolis, the dialect of the inscription would point rather to the Doric Hexapolis, or to the Megarian colonies on the sea of Marmora and of the Black Sea. Special words seem to point to the latter region and in particular to Chalkedon; this location being supported by the name of the month Διονυσίος and the verb *αἰσιμῶν* (cf. *αἰσιμνήτης*, etc.) Both are found in the Chalcedonian inscription No. 3794 C. I. G. We note but one of the many interesting provisions of this decree, namely that which, according to Dittenberger's reading (p. 172, l. 15) stipulates: ἐξέστω δὲ καὶ (π)αῖδι ὠνεῖσθαι ἀ(λ)λῳι δὲ μηθὲν ἐξέστω τὰν ἱερωτεία(ν ἢ ἐαντ)ῶν; i. e. a father may buy (a priestly office) for his son, but nobody else may buy excepting for himself.

Another inscription commented upon is one of the Macedonian period, and of the times of the Achaean league; viz. regarding the accession of (Arcadian) Orchomenus to the Achaean league; published first by Foucart, *Revue Archéologique*, 1876, p. 96. The main point in which D. differs from the French scholar is in the date. Foucart assumes the year 129 when Orchomenus was dismissed from the Macedonian suzerainty, but Dittenberger assumes an earlier date, in the latter half of the 3d century B. C.

Important details of Greek history of this obscure period are contained in this interesting inscription.

The remaining observations of Dittenberger are of minor interest.

J. Freudenthal (Breslau) in his Notes on Proclus and the younger Olympiodorus reasserts a view of his as against Zeller, viz. that Olympiodorus in his prolegomena to Plato p. 26 reports of Proclus, that he ἐκβάλλει the Republic (τὰς Πολιτείας) of Plato as well as the Νόμοι. Zeller has explained this ἐκβάλλειν in a relative sense, viz. from the dialogues, but not from the body of Platonic works.

Of course the Prolegomena, as well as the βίος, are not the direct production of Olympiodorus, but a body of notes derived from lectures by Olympiodorus. This fact explains a number of blunders in these synopses. But Freudenthal suggests another explanation of the remarkable judgment of Proclus; he calls attention to the veritable deluge of books produced by Proclus in the course of a literary and academic career extending from his 24th to his 76th year.

Within the limits of so long a period of copious writing and lecturing, such an inconsistency may have well occurred as is implied in the statement ascribed to him above. A lively sketch of the literary and philosophical character of Proclus is given by Freudenthal on pp. 218-219.

A communication of uncommon interest is that by Jordan: Old Latin Inscription from Rome. This remarkable inscription was first published at Rome, by Dr. Dressel, in the *Annali dell' Istituto*, 1880, 158 pp., with an accurate colored representation of the earthen vessel on which it is engraved. Jordan's reading, which differs from that of the first editor, is as follows:

(I.) IOVEI SAT DEIVOS QOI MED MITAT NEITED ENDO COSMIS UIRICO SIED (intermediate space) ASTED NOIIS OPE TOITESIAI PAK ARI VOIS

(II.) DUENOS MED FEC ED EN MANOM EINOM DZ E NOINE MED MAO STATOD.

Passing by Jordan's criticism of Dressel and of Bücheler, let us consider his own views; according to which the equivalent in classic (or here = later) Latin would be about the following:

(I.) *Iovi Saturno divis qui me mittat, ne in te comis virgo sit; ast nisi Opi Toitesiae pacari vis.* Whoever sends me to Jupiter or Saturnus, let not a maiden be friendly to thee; except you are willing to make your peace with Ops Toitesia.

(II.) *Duenus me fecit in manum enim die noni me ma(n)o sistito: i. e.* Duenus made me; he shall place me at the festival of the manes on the ninth day.

The sacrifice referred to is that made to a dead one nine days after the burial. Nine days was the regular limit for the *lucus*; both Jupiter and Saturn are to receive an offering at the end of this period of nine days' special mourning.

Jordan then proceeds to discuss many points in the history of Latin etymology, *e. g.* the change of *s* to *r*, and expresses his conviction that in the present case the Latin of the writer was influenced by the Umbrian and other dialects.

In the syntactical portion of his paper he classes *endo* with the dissyllabic spurious prepositions *ergo*, *tenuis*, *inter*; in the present instance *endo* (Lucretius *indu*) is postpositive.

As regards date, Jordan observes that the inscription belongs to the time before the Second Punic War. Professor Bücheler, of Bonn, wrote an article on this same inscription in the *Rheinisches Museum* 36, 235 sqq.¹

Chr. Belger. A new mathematical fragment from Bobbio. This is a fragment of a mathematico-physical treatise on the construction of the burning-

¹ M. Bréal (Académie des Inscriptions, séance du 2 Mars 1882) reads:

IOVEIS AT DEIVOS QOI ME DMITAT, NEI TED ENDO, COSMISV IRICO, SIRD.
Jupiter aut deus qui me admittat, ne te endo, commissi ergo, sit

AS[T] TED NOIIS, IO PETO, ITES IAI PACARI VOIS.
Ast te nobis, eo penso, Ιταίς ΙΙΙς, pacari velis.

DZENOS MED FEKED EN MANOM. EINOM DZENOI NE MED MALO STATOD.
Dzenos me fecit in bonum. Nunc Dzeno 'ne me malo sistito.

The vase is the speaker, placed by the side of a dead man. It contains offerings to the god. "Jupiter, or whoever may be the god who shall receive me, may not this man (the dead) fall into thy power for his faults. But let thyself, by virtue of this gift, be appeased by these prayers. Dzenos made me for good. Do not take me amiss for Dzeno." M. Bréal assigns the inscription to the third century B. C. A suggestion was made to read QOI MED MITAT *cui me mittat*—"Jupiter, or whoever may be the god to whom he sends me."—B. L. G.

glass (πίριον), derived from the Benedictine monastery of Bobbio and preserved in the Ambrosian library at Florence. There is a great deal of a kind of shorthand in this fragment, and many other particular modes of abbreviation, *e. g.* *κν-* for *κύκλος*, *γω-* for *γωνία*, *τμ-* for *τμήμα*. The fragment is probably from some Byzantine textbook of the sixth century A. D.

Johannes Weber contributes a minor article on Interpolations of the Roman Fasti; from a collation of one particularly ancient MS. of Diodorus. A number of errors in the MS. used by Dindorf, as well as in the Fasti Capitolini, are shown. The magistrates referred to in the present communication are particularly the military tribunes with consular power, of the age of Camillus, 410 sqq. B. C.

H. Droysen examines the Athenian decree in honor of Zeno, *i. e.* the founder of the Stoic school, who died about 265–264 B. C. This decree is preserved in Diogenes Laertius VII 26, 16. The standard of criticism employed by Droysen is the set form of an Attic *ψήφισμα* of that age as expressed in the inscriptions of the same time. His result is a twofold one: 1. The general character of the document, apart from some minutiae of formulation, seems to be genuine; 2. Two distinct decrees are blended into one. The first, providing public commendation and a golden wreath, was passed of course before the death of the philosopher; the burial in the Ceramicus was decreed after his death.

E. Hübner enumerates the several parts of the armament or military garb of Roman legionaries, basing his description largely on two relief-portraits of a *centurio* and a *signifer* of the age of Nero and of Vespasian at Verona.

M. Schanz. Note on Stichometry. The specimen of line-counting which Schanz adduces is found in the Clarkian MS. of Plato, and there in the *Cratylus* and *Symposium*. By computing the intervals, Schanz has noted that the average distance of these marks is about 100 times 35 letters. Now 35 letters is the average length of an hexameter. Hence it would seem that the length of the hexameter was the unit of measurement, the distance of one hundred of these being marked off each time. The value of such marking of lines is palpable enough to guarantee the integrity of the copy both from a critical and commercial point of view.

E. G. SIHLER.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. IX, Part III.

In the first article in this part (pp. 225–244) Naber continues his *Sophoclea*. His conjectures are not always happy. For instance, on O. T. 1143,

φέρ' εἰπὲ νῦν, τότ' οἶσθα παῖδά μοι τινα
δούς, ὡς ἐμαντῶ θρέμμα θρεψαίμην ἐγώ;

he writes, 'in tali sententia nonne requiritur futurum *θρεψοίμην*? In vicinia eadem mihi suspicio nata est, vs. 1174,

Οἶδ. ἢ γὰρ δίδωσιν ἡδε σοι; Θερ. μάλιστ' ἀναξ.
Οἶδ. ὡς πρὸς τί χρείας; Θερ. ὡς ἀναλώσαιμι νιν.

Ibi quoque ἀναλώσοιμι malo. Potuisset respondere: ὡς ἐμοῦ ἀναλώσοντος, non sane ἀναλώσαντος. Forma orationis mutata est; sed nullam causam video, cur simul cum modo tempus quoque commutetur. Recte editur Oed. Tyr. vs. 792,

ὡς μητρὶ μὲν χρεῖη με μιχθῆναι, γένος δ'
ἀτλητον ἀνθρώποισι δηλώσοιμι ὀρᾶν.

ibidemque vs. 1271

αὐδῶν τοιαῦθ', ὀθύνεκε' οὐκ ὀψοιντό νιν,
οὐθ' οἷ' ἐπασχεν οὐθ' ὅποι' ἔδρα κακά,
ἀλλ' ἐν σκότῳ τὸ λοιπὸν οὗς μὲν οὐκ ἔδει
ὀψοίαθ', οὗς δ' ἐχρηξεν οὐ γνῶσοίατο.'

It seems very surprising that Naber should see no distinction between the nature of the last two passages and that of the former pair. In the latter the optative forms are due to the indirect mode of statement, and would be represented in direct speech by *χρή, δηλώσεις, ὀψονται, γνώσονται*. But Naber surely would not say that *θρέψομαι* or *ἀναλώσω* represents the meaning of the optative in either of the former passages. Again on O. C. 41 (τίνων τὸ σεμνὸν ὄνομ' ἀν εὐξαίμην κλύων;) he writes: 'Vertit Nauckius, "quarumnam sancto audito nomine invocabo (illas)," et hoc ut probet, affert Oed. Tyr. 117: ὅπου τις ἐκμαθὼν ἐχρήσατ' ἄν. Itaque non videtur animadvertisse κλύων praesentis temporis esse et ea potestate facile ferremus aoristum ἀκούσας, sed absonum est praesens ἀκούων. Nihil aliud latet nisi: τίνων τὸ σεμνὸν ὄνομ' ἀν εὐξαίμην λέγων;' Naber appears here to limit unduly the functions of κλύων. Cf. Eur. Hec. 967 (λέγουσα μύθους ὧν κλύων ἀφικόμεν), Or. 1554, I. T. 901, &c. On the other hand, some of his proposed changes are ingenious, if not probable. For instance: on O. C. 727 (θάρσει, παρέσται· καὶ γὰρ εἰ γέρων ἐγώ, τὸ τῆσδε χώρας οὐ γεγήρακεν σθένος) he argues that Oedipus had not asked for the aid of the other citizens, but of the Chorus itself (v. 724 ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐμοὶ φαίνονται ἄν ἡδὴ τέρμα τῆς σωτηρίας), and that the old men were not too weak to repel Creon's violence, as is shown by l. 815, 840, 857. He therefore proposes to read *χειρός* for *χώρας*. In El. 567, where Electra reports the cause of the anger of Artemis, she says that her father παίζων κατ' ἄλσος ἐξεκίνησεν ποδοῖν σικτὸν κεράστῃν ἑλαφόν, and unfortunately vaunted his achievement. 'Primum jam satis difficile est *pede* cervum ἐκκινεῖν, sed *pedibus* quomodo id fieri possit, non video.' It appears one inferior MS. reads ἐξενίκησεν. 'Non lubenter recipere solemus deteriorum Codicum lectiones: tamen verum est ἐξενίκησεν. Agamemnon cervum cursu vicit.' On El. 596 he notes that *ιεῖς, τιθεῖς* are the correct forms, not *ιης, τίθης*, as Porson maintained; and quotes a large number of instances in which the MSS. present the correct spelling. But here Wecklein has already adopted them in his edition. On El. 1457 (χαίρεις ἄν, εἰ σοι χαρτὰ τυγχάνοι τάδε) he writes: 'Si non habes dicere, quo optativus pertineat, mecum fortasse non recusabis scribere: *τυγχάνει*.' But here the indic. was proposed by Herm., and has been adopted by Wolff and Jebb. In Phil. 617 Odysseus is said to have promised, after hearing that the presence of Philoctetes was indispensable to the success of the Greeks, τὸν ἀνδρ' Ἀχαιοῖς τόνδε δηλώσειν ἄγων· οἰοίτο μὲν μάλισθ' ἐκούσιον λαβῶν, εἰ μὴ θέλοι δ', ἄκοντα. On this Naber writes: 'Ad illud οἰοίτο primum Nauckium audiemus: *ein dem Deutschen gebrauch entsprechender Optativ in fortgesetzter orat.*

obliqua. Deinde ut probet Graecos similiter dixisse, affert Aesch. Agam. 606 ἀπάγγελον πόσει ἤκειν, — γυναικα πιστήν δ' ἐν δόμοις εὔροι μολόν, sed haec dum scribebat, fortasse non potuit cognoscere Cobeti disputationem, qui luculenter evicit scribendum esse ἐνδον εἰρήσει. [This conjecture of Cobet's seems very unnecessary: εὔροι no doubt expresses an ironical wish.] 'Sed nihil opus est pluribus ostendere οἰοιτο esse corruptum, quod nihil significabit, etiamsi quis ad mirum usum optativi modi connivere velit. Emenda, nam hoc emendare appello ubi ne umbra quidem dubitationis superest, οἶόν τε μὲν μάλισθ' κτέ. Sic convenientia Graeci sermonis cum Germanorum usu tenues dilabatur in auras.'¹

C. M. Francken contributes the next article (pp. 245-272) on Cicero's oration *pro A. Caecina*. He thus begins: 'Quae ad causam Caecinianam pertinent nuper tam copiose quam eleganter exposita sunt a viro Consultissimo J. Kappeyne van de Coppello in libro: *over VIM FACERE in het interdictum uti possidetis*. Uitgegeven door de Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Amst. 1880. Eam disputationem non esse Latine scriptam doleo non tam nostra causa quam exterorum. Nemo enim apud nos existet, qui hoc genus orationis nitidum et fustum aspernetur: exteris autem sic aliqua difficultas obiiicitur; et in perpetuo flumine librorum et libellorum, quo prela sudant et viri docti paene obruuntur, ea potissimum appetuntur, quae, ceteris quidem (ut aiunt) paribus, sine putamine molesto fructum offerunt et saporem.' He therefore thinks it worth while 'quaedam ex ea commentatione delibare non iurisconsultis sed philologis. Qui si eam orationem, quoniam in iure versatur tota, iurisconsultis relinquunt ac non contra vindicant, non tantum magna se privant voluptate, sed etiam officio desunt. Est enim una ex optimis Tullianis, et ad eius ingenium et eloquentiam cognoscenda quantivis pretii.' The article is very able and interesting, but does not yield much that can be briefly extracted. On the passage in § 39 'huiusce rei vos statuētis nullam esse actionem, nullum experiundi ius constitutum, qui obstiterit armatis hominibus, qui multitudine coacta non introitu sed omnino aditu quempiam prohibuerit?' he denies that any passage of Cicero can be adduced that will justify the use of *qui* for *in eum qui*. 'Tum demum credam Latinum esse si e. g. "invehitur qui eum laesit prior" putare licebit dici pro "invehitur in eum, qui—" Quantum video, non potest locus in integrum restitui, nisi duas literas si excidissemus statuamus.'

The third article (pp. 273-302) is by Naber, entitled ΤΡΙΤΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΡΧΟΜΑΙ, and contains a large number of conjectural emendations on the

¹I fear that it is useless to protest against the way in which Dutch scholars are rewriting Greek syntax. If the examples in Krüger 154 6 A. 4 and Kühner p. 593 Anm. 2, cited for the change to the optative, are not satisfactory, I am at a loss to know what will satisfy the Batavian mind. It is true that the Greek does not fall into *oratio obliqua* as readily as does the Roman, but *ὁπείσχετο* in the passage cited from Sophokles is introduction enough. In Lys. 13, 9 the very word οἰοιτο occurs. See Frohberger on the passage. Krüger says (l. c.) that in this continuation of the discourse *ὅτι* or *ὥς* cannot be used with the opt. The reason for this seems evident. The change of construction from the infinitive to the opt. is due to an anacoluthon of which the writer or speaker would be reminded by the *ὅτι* or *ὥς*, and the essence of the change is unconsciousness. Hence in Xen. Anab. 4, 3, 29, *ὅτι* is to be construed causally and not objectively—'because' not 'that.' Anthon calmly combines the two views: "'because that one would be the best man': i. e., adding that he would be, &c." Evidently puzzled by the inconsistency of K.'s note (*q. v.*), he compromised by taking both statements.—B. L. G.

text of the New Testament. It will perhaps be best in this case to give a considerable number of his suggestions, though room cannot be found for the reasoning by which they are supported. Matt. v. 13. *ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μαρανθῇ* (for *μωρανθῇ*). 25. *καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθῇ* (for *βληθῇσιν*). 33. *ἐμπεδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὀρκούς σου* (for *ἀποδώσεις*.) Matt. vii. 25. *προσέπαισαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ* (for *προσέπεσαν*). Matt. xii. 41. *ἐν τῇ κρίσει κατὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης* (for *μετά*). Matt. xviii. 24. *ὀφειλέτης πολλῶν ταλάντων* (for *μυρίων*). 42. *καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ἀποδοθῆναι* (for *καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι*). Matt. xxiii. 25. *ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐτι ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκрасίας* (for *ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς*). On Matt. xxvii. 17. *τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν*, he refers to a tradition reported by Origen and a schol. that Ἰησοῦς was the personal name of Barabbas: and from this he suggests doubtfully that the words in v. 20 *ἵνα αἰτήσονται τὸν Βαραββᾶν τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν* should read *ἵνα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσωσιν*. Mark vi. 5. *ἐθαύμασε λίαν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν* (for *ἐθαύμασεν διὰ*). Mark vii. 4. *ῥαντισμοὺς ποτηρίων* (for *βαπτισμοίς*). 19. *ἐκπορεύεται θύραζε πάντα τὰ βρώματα* (for *καθαρίζων*). [Naber does not seem to have thought of the construction, adopted by the late Revisers, which makes *καθαρίζων* agree with the subject of the previous *λέγει αὐτοῖς*, with the sense, 'thus making all meats clean.'] Mark x. 21. *ἠλέησεν αὐτόν* (for *ἡγάπησεν*). 30. The words *οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς* . . . *μετὰ διωγμῶν* are to be expunged. Luke vii. 44-46 *ὑδωρ-οὐκ ἔδωκας, φίλημα-οὐκ ἔδωκας, τὴν κεφαλὴν-οὐκ ἤλειψας*, the negatives are to be removed; on the ground that the omission of the ordinary marks of civility is incredible. 'Liberum erat Simoni Jesum non vocare, sed postquam vocavit, ut rusticitatis crimen effugeret, id omne praestare debuit quod moribus requirebatur. Ibidem liberum erat Jesu non ire ad Pharisaicum, sed statim abire debuit, postquam animadvertit sibi debita officia non praestari.—Quo diutius locum considero, eo mea ratio certior videtur.' Luke xi. 3. *τὸν ἄρτον αἰτοῦσιν δὸς ὑμῖν σήμερον* (for *ἐπιούσιον*). Acts xix. 16. *κατακυριεύσας ἄφνω ἰσχυσε κατ' αὐτῶν* (for *ἀμφοτέρων*). Acts xxii. 23. *ῥηγνύντων τὰ ἱμάτια* (for *ριπτούντων*). Acts xxvi. 28. *ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πέποιθας Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι* (for *πείθεις*). Acts xxvii. 38. *ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν ἱσθὺν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* (for *τὸν σῖτον*.) It is argued that v. 18 shows that everything had been thrown overboard which could be dispensed with, even *τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου*: and it must be supposed that the *τροφὴ* spoken of in vv. 34 and 38 was only a small portion of the cargo (probably of wheat) reserved for the food of the ship's company. 'Nimiam ea fuit imprudentia eicere quem solum habebant commeatum.—Deinde si in mare eiecissent illud omne unde victus sibi suppeteret, quantillum id erat ut navis levaretur? Verum, ut conjicio, ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον, non ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν ΣΙΤΟΝ, sed τὸν ΙΣΤΟΝ. Hoc extremum consilium perditis rebus supererat. Metuebant praeterea, uti arbitrator, ne sibi accideret quod Achilles Tatiuss scribit naufragis accidisse, p. 91, 27; ibi enim navis λανθάνει προσνεχθεῖσα ὑφάλῳ πέτρα καὶ ῥήγνεται πᾶσα, deinde ὁ ἱσθὺς ἐπὶ θάτερα πεσὼν τὸ μὲν τι κατέκλασε, τὸ δὲ τι κατέδυσεν αὐτῆς. Simul autem cum malo maiore, nam τὸν μέγαν ἱσθὺν simpliciter ἱσθὺν appellant, perierat magnum velum, quod aliquot diebus ante cum reliquis armamentis fortasse jam eiectum fuerat, unde per tot dies incerti et consilii inopes διεφέροντο ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ. Sed supererat ὁ ἀκάτειος ἱσθός, malus minor, cui parvum velum adaptari potuit. Hinc, ut est vs. 41, ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμωνα τῇ πνεοῦσῃ κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν αἰγυαλόν.

Nunc demum intelligimus cur exciso et abjecto maiore malo, τοῦ ἀπρέμωτος mentio fiat.'

Cobet next has an article (pp. 303-339) containing corrections of Cornelius Nepos. Two or three specimens of his notes may be quoted. Themist. VII 5. *Apud quam iam bis classes regias fecisse naufragium.* This statement is false; since after the battle at Marathon the fleet returned safe to Asia with the prisoners from Eretria. 'Multum igitur mihi arridebat Peerlkampii emendatio qua omnis difficultas removetur: OPES regias. *Opes* enim et apud alios et saepe apud Nepotem dicitur de copiis tam terrestribus quam navalibus.—Quamquam autem OPES ab initio multum arridebat, tamen αἱ δεύτεραι φροντίδες meliorem lectionem suggererunt, quam recipimus: *bis* COPIAS regias fecisse naufragium.' Them. VII 6. *Quare si suos legatos recipere vellent, quos Athenas miserant, se remitterent: aliter illos numquam in patriam essent recepturi.* The fault should be corrected by reading *esse reversuros*. 'εὐφροῖα haec est, sed quid dicat satis est perspicuum. Apud Suetonium in *Caesare* cap. 13, *Caesar pontificatum maximum petens, cum mane ad Comitia descenderet praedixisse matri osculanti fertur domum se nisi Pontificem non reversurum.* Caesar, si repulsam tulisset, manus [sic] sibi consciscere decreverat. Themistocles Lacedaemoniis dixit nisi ipse remitteretur legatis eorum necem esse paratam.' On Cim. IV 3, he refers to his correction given in this Journal, Vol. II, p. 249, and adds, 'Quod Scaliger alicubi dixit *Codices esse sterquilinia* vel hic unus locus quam verum sit declarat. Pro *coquebatur* sunt qui exhibeant *QUO QUEREBATUR*: pro *invocatos convocatos*: pro *devocaret devoraret* et *devorarent*: pro *intermittebat* *PRAETERMITTEBAT*: pro *quotidie cotidie* et *cotidie*. [But see Neue, i. 676.] Quid eo homine facias qui scribat: *cottidie sic cena ei quo querebatur ut quos convocatos vidisset in foro omnes devoraret.*' On Alcibiad. V 1, *itaque tempus eius interficiendi quaerere instituerunt*, he prefers to read *institerunt*, id est *coeperunt*. He shows by a large number of examples that we should say 'iter, viam, cursum *insistere*, non *instituere*.' Caesar, he maintains, always used this form, 'sed in expellendo verbo antiquiore libriorum natio tamquam coniurasse videtur.' On Datam. V 2, *qua celeritate cum magnam benevolentiam regis Datames consecutus esset, non minorem invidiam aulicorum excepit*, he writes: 'non est Latinum *Datames invidiam aulicorum excepit*. Corrigendum arbitror: *non minor eum invidia aulicorum excepit*. Idem nunc video olim Bosio placuisse: "*sic enim* (inquit) *solent Latini scriptores.*" Sed deinde nactus, ut putabat, simile exemplum apud Curtium, bonam correctionem abiicit dicens: "*excipere est suscipere.*" Cras credam.' On Attic. XXI 6, *quare a vobis peto PRIMUM ut consilium probetis meum, DEINDE ne frustra dehortando impedire conemini*, he says: non duas res ab amicis petit sed *unam*. *Primum* et deinde eodem sensu ponuntur quo Graece μάλιστα μὲν — εἰ δὲ μή. Sic datur optio ut quod potissimum velis addatur verbis μάλιστα μὲν (*primum*), quod cum fieri non possit verbis εἰ δὲ μή subiicitur id quo contentus sis.' [In Hdt. I 59 we have a similar use of πρῶτα μὲν — δεύτερα: συνεβούλενε Ἰπποκράτει πρῶτα μὲν γυναῖκα τεκνοποιῶν μὴ ἀγεσθαι ἐς τὰ οἶκα, εἰ δὲ τυγχάνει ἔχων, δεύτερα τὴν γυναῖκα ἐκπέμπευ.]

The concluding portion of the *Epistula Critica* of J. B. Kan to Cobet follows (pp. 340-354). He criticises passages in Caesar, *Bell. Gall.*, in Cicero's orations, and other Latin writers, and also in Xenophon's *Hellenica*, Demosthenes' *de Corona*, Aeschylus' *Agam.*, and Sophocles' *Oed. Tyr.*

In the last article (pp. 355-360) Cobet offers emendations for some passages in Galen and Appian. In commenting on a passage in Galen he takes occasion to correct Plat. Rep. 345 c. τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς ποιμένα — ΠΟΙΜΑΙΝΕΙΝ οἶμι τὰ πρόβατα. 'Mendosum est ποιμαίνειν: requiritur enim verbum significans pastoris in curando grege studium et diligentiam. Graeculus nescio quis sensit vitium et repperit Platonis sententiam sed non Platonis manum: substituit enim παχίνειν pro ποιμαίνειν. Sed Plato scripserat ΠΙΑΙΝΕΙΝ, id est πίονα ποιεῖν, pro quo Galenus dixit κατασκευάζουσιν αὐτὰ πίονα.' He says that after writing this he looked into Bekker's *Commentarius Criticus*, and found that the Paris MS. A, the best of all, had πιαίνειν, which Stallbaum had neglected to note.

He quotes a passage from Galen, viii, p. 190, illustrating Dem. 54, 9 (Conon) Θεώμενος δέ τις ἄλλος ἀλεκτρύννας ἄδοντας, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι τὰς πτέρυγας προσέκρουον πρὸ φώγης, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς τοὺς βραχίονας προσκρούων ταῖς πλευραῖς ἐμμεῖτο τὴν φωνὴν τῶν ζώων. And another merely for its curiosity: Φόβος δ' ἦν ἄλλῳ μήπως ὁ βαστάζων τὸν κόσμον Ἀτλας ἀποσεῖσθαι κεκμηκῶς αὐτὸν οὕτως τε καὶ αὐτὸς συντριβεῖν καὶ ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ συναπολέσειεν.

C. D. MORRIS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. VI.

No. I.

I. Pp. 1-21. In his studies on Demosthenes (II), H. Weil discusses the authenticity of the first oration against Aristogeiton. (This précis gives an outline of the *method* rather than of the substance.) I. First, the author states the views of scholars, ancient and modern. Among the former, Dionysius Hal. and a few others held that the oration was unworthy of Demosthenes, whilst Plutarch and nearly all others regarded it as genuine. Of the moderns, since Casaubon, hardly any except Ruhnken agree with Hemsterhuys and Valkenaer in regarding it as a work of the great orator. The author, without first setting forth his views, gives the general presumptions against the authenticity. II. He then propounds the question: Is the oration *authentic*?—that is, a real speech, made on some occasion by some orator, whether D. or not, against a defendant named Aristogeiton; or is it a mere essay, written for an imaginary process, and attributed to D.? He here discusses the special arguments against authenticity (in the sense defined above) with such impartiality that we can only gather gradually which side he advocates; and in the discussion he produces strong arguments in favor of authenticity. III. He then takes up the question: Who was the orator? and shows that the oration of Hyperides *πρὸς Ἀριστογείτονα* should never have been identified (as has been done) with this oration *κατὰ Ἀριστογείτονος*, the former being a *defence*, the latter a *prosecution*. He shows further that the style is not that of H., and points out strong resemblances between this oration and some genuine orations of D., especially the *perorations*. But this entire speech is of the nature of a peroration; in other words it is an *ὑξησης* following the speech of Lykourgos. He then gives a number of details showing that there is no sufficient reason for doubting that the author was Demosthenes himself. The political and judicial affairs at Athens from the battle of Chaironeia to the death of Demosthenes (the speech

can be shown to have been delivered not long before his death) were of such a character as tended to produce the modifications which are visible when we compare this oration with the *De Corona*. In fact the *In Midiam* exhibits an intermediate state, bearing about the same stylistic relation to the *De Corona* that our oration does to the *In Midiam*. The rhythmic and euphonic laws (relating to succession of short syllables and to hiatus) are the same as in the unquestioned works of D.¹

2. P. 21. In Quintil. VIII 3, 26, L. Havet divides *dicendi uersum ei* so as to secure *diuersum ei*, but attempts no further emendation.

3. Pp. 22-27. And now the Fut. Indic. with *äv* is no more. In an article entitled *De futuro iuncto cum particula condicionali apud Homerum*, H. van Herwerden, stating at the outset that scarcely any scholars now-a-days defend this construction in other authors, proceeds to remove the examples from Homer. He divides the discussion into six sections: I. Examples with *äv*, in which the verb is really in the *subjunctive with a short vowel*, as in B 488: οὐκ *äv* ἐγὼ μὴ θήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω. Six indisputable instances are cited, and a seventh (I 167: τοὺς *äv* ἐγὼν ἐπιόψομαι) is shown to belong here. II. Similar examples with *κε(ν)*,—more than thirty in number. III. Examples where there is MS. authority for the absence of *äv* (*κε*), or for the subj., as Z 260, καὶτὸς for κ' αὐτὸς. Eight or nine instances. A 139: ὁ δὲ *κεν* κεχολῶσεται was pronounced spurious even by Alexandrian critics. IV. Examples where it is a question of interpretation of early copies, as A 174: οἱ *κέ* με τιμήσουσι, i. e. ΤΙΜΗΣΟΥΣΙ=τιμήσωσι as well. Eight instances. V. "Emendations" by means of slight changes, as A 523: ἐμοὶ δὲ *κέ* ταῦτα μελήσεται: read δὲ γε. Five or six examples. VI. Only two examples remain. 1. Θ 404-5, repeated 417-18. These verses can well be spared at either place, and contain two impossibilities: first, ἐς δεκάτους, instead of ἐς δέκα . . . ἐνιαυτοὺς or ἐς δέκατον . . . ἐνιαυτόν, and secondly, the "vim et usum verbi μάρπτειν inauditam." 2. Δ 176: καὶ *κέ* τις ὥδ' (ὥς because of following *ε*) ἐρέει,—an expression which occurs only here, whereas the idea is expressed elsewhere by a fixed formula, καὶ ποτὲ τις εἶπρ(σι), which occurs several times, or ὥδε δὲ τις ἐρέει which occurs, indeed, only once, but ὥδε τις εἶπσκε repeatedly. Besides, "pro spurio habet Nitzchius." Hence this, being the only example about which there can be any reasonable doubt, cannot be regarded as establishing the construction. [Though comments are out of place here, I venture a remark or two. If I did not almost distrust my own judgment when it is favorable to an "emendation" of Herwerden's, I should regard the case as pretty well made out. But inasmuch as Herwerden thinks that Θ 404-5 was interpolated by a "poetastro non satis callente epicum sermonem ante tempora Alexandrina," may it not be that others, influenced by the misunderstood Homeric examples, admitted the construction, and that too even in prose? If so, it became Greek. Besides the few examples of the Fut. Opt. with *äv*=Fut. Indic. with *äv* in indirect dis-

¹ In a paper on the articular infinitive published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878 I gave the general result of my examination of the usage of the orators in this regard. The statistics there presented brought out very clearly Demosthenes' notorious fondness for the construction. Deinarchus comes nearest to him, but only to his lower level,—that of the private speeches. I have never published the detailed work, and in view of M. Weil's discussion it may be worth while to note that the average of articular infinitives in the speech against Aristogeiton is nearly the same as that in the speech against Meidias.—B. L. G.

course are also involved. Herwerden, however, assumes that there are no defensible instances of the Fut. with *av* outside of Homer, and I suppose he includes the Opt. This theory, if accepted, with the recent explosion of the *ν ἐφελκυστικόν* doctrine, will lead to material modifications of our grammars.]

4. Pp. 28-36. The *Carmen Paschale* and the *Opus Paschale* of Sedulius. (Gaston Boissier). The Christian poet Sedulius wrote the *Carmen Paschale* (recounting in heroic verse the miracles of the Old and the New Testaments) between A. D. 424 and 450, dedicating it to the priest Macedonius, who, fearing that the exigencies of verse might have forced the author to depart from the strict line of orthodoxy, induced him to write a prose paraphrase to accompany the poem; hence the *Opus Paschale*. We are thus enabled to compare the language of prose with that of poetry during that period. I. The poetry of S. is much simpler and clearer,—in fact, from our standpoint, more prosaic, than his prose. This is due in part, no doubt, to the fact that he first wrote the poetry, and then had to seek new modes of expression for his prose paraphrase. But this does not explain all the differences; and we may by this work judge the prose of the period, except such as was written in imitation of Cicero. To judge, then, by the works of S., the language of prose was much less simple, less correct and more corrupt, than that of poetry. Words from the vulgar dialect had crept in, with the meanings which they now have in the romance languages, as *populatio* = population, perhaps even *causa* = thing (*cosa, chose*). Also constructions, as *de aqua baptizatus, similitudinem de iuvenco*. Especially striking is “*curavit ut vacuasset*” for “*ut vacuaret*.” [This shows the origin of the French imperf. subj. Comp. Amer. Jour. of Philol., Vol. I, p. 410 ff.] Many words had experienced a change of meaning, or were used with vagueness; and there seems to have been an aversion to saying anything in simple, direct language. Compare the following passages relating to the slaughter of the innocents. The *Carmen* says simply:

Haec laceros crines nudato vertice rupit,
Illa genas secuit;

whilst the *Opus* puts it thus: “*Haec effusam vultibus comam miseranda dilacerans crinalis damni foeditate nudum verticem sauciabat; illa madidas lacrimosis imbris genas unguum protervitate sulcabat.*” II. Hence we see that two distinct languages were used, one for prose, the other for poetry; and however strange the fact may seem to us, the language of prose no doubt seemed natural, and that of poetry forced and obscure to the majority of the people. But the corruption was due not only to the influence of the *sermo popularis* which existed already in classic times, but to a certain strained effort to speak with elegance—to a disinclination to express thoughts directly and simply; in short, to an aesthetic movement in the lettered world.

5. Pp. 37-51. Variants of a Strasburg MS. containing, among other things, the Harmonic Elements of Aristoxenos. (C. E. Ruelle). The author collated a part of this MS. a very short time before it perished along with the library, when the Protestant seminary was destroyed by the artillery of Baden in 1870. This article is of great importance for students of Aristoxenos, especially as the MS. in question no longer exists.

6. P. 51. Note on Paulini Carmen ad Nicetam, v. 292, by Chatelain, showing that for *labis unquam* we must read *nulla labes*.

7. Pp. 52-72. Critical Remarks on the Menippeae of Varro. (L. Havet.) This article is divided into six sections. It is impossible to give in a brief compass more than a most meagre table of the contents. I. The titles and sub-titles of *Menippeae*. Thirty works have these double titles, the one in Latin, the other (sub-title) in Greek (περί with a noun), as *Testamentum, περὶ διαθηκῶν*. The titles of both kinds were probably prefixed by Varro himself, the Latin at the time the works were composed, the Greek at a later day when the young humorist had become the old philologist. II. The *Eumenides*. Outline of contents. Discussion of five fragments, with emendations. III. *Testamentum*. Fragment emended. IV. *Sesquialixes*. Five fragments discussed. V. Ταφὴ Μενίππου. General investigation. Two fragments discussed. VI. *Parmeno*. This Menippea is made up of very unlike portions, which the author sorts. 1. Two fragments in acatalectic cretics emended. 2. A fragment in catalectic cretics emended. 3. Five paeonian fragments discussed.

8. Pp. 72-75. Grammatical Notes (continued), by O. Riemann. (a) The impersonal passive in Greek. A few exceptions to Krüger's rule pointed out, where the tense is a perfect, as ἐμοὶ βοηθήσεται τῷ νόμῳ. One example where the tense is not perf.: Thuc. I 73, 2. (b) Objective genitive of personal pronouns in Greek. As to the second person, the truth lies between Krüger (47, 7, A 8) and Kühner (II, 454, 3, A 11). Cf. Soph. Elect. 1036. (c) λέγω, δέικνυμι, etc., ὥς. Criticism of Madvig's rules. Examples cited where ὥς does not imply any doubt on the part of the narrator. It is used even after verbs of *knowing, learning, showing*. (d) The author corrects a mistake which he made, Rev. de Phil. V, p. 166, l. 21-22.

9. Pp. 76-103. Unpublished scholia of Juvenal. (C. Beldame.) The municipal library of Nice owns a MS. of the 12th century containing the Satires of Juvenal and Persius, with numerous notes on the margin and between the lines, by far the greater part being of earlier origin than the MS., and having been copied by the same hand as the MS. That the copyist is not the author of the notes is shown by instances where he wrote the wrong word in the text, but copied the explanation correctly, as:

-1- testiculos

"More supervacuam cultris abrumpere carmen,"

in which he mistook *carnem* for *carmen*. Several instances of this are found. The age of the author cannot be fixed with precision. He alludes to the old church of St. Peter, built in 326. He seems to have been well read in Greek and Latin, and refers to a work of his own on orthography. He invokes the authority of Homer, Sophokles, Plato, Plutarch. He refers to many Latin authors (from Varro to Priscian), sometimes quoting their exact words. Among these quotations are seven from Festus "de verborum significatione," but they are very much like the corresponding passages in the abridgment of Paulus Diac. The scholia are generally explanatory, but sometimes they are critical—a rare thing in those days. Beldame gives the scholia to the first six satires, amounting to 24 pages.

10. P. 103. L. Havet calls attention to Cic. de Off. III 3, 15, as cited by Nonius (Quicherat, p. 488 M, 20), showing that Nonius has preserved the true reading, "quod *idem*."

11. CHARLES GRAUX. A biographical sketch by E. Chatelain. The career of this wonderful genius demands some space. Charles Graux was born at Vervins (Aisne), Nov. 23, 1852, and died at Paris, Jan. 13, 1882. At the college of Vervins he omitted two years (the sixth and the fourth classes) by extraordinary promotion, and yet carried away all prizes throughout his course. In 1868 he went to Paris and received the degrees of *Bachelier ès Sciences* and *Bachelier ès Lettres*. In 1871 he entered the *École des Hautes Études* as a pupil, and studied palaeography under Tournier; and in 1872 was admitted as *Licencié ès Lettres*, his Greek thesis attaining the highest grade. From this time on he had access to the Greek MSS. of the National Library, and Greek Palaeography became his vocation. Prosecuting his studies further, in 1873 he was considered by Tournier competent to direct palaeographic discussions in his stead. The 10th vol. of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* contains his first works. In October, 1874, he became "*répétiteur de philologie et d'antiquités grecques*," which place he held for seven years, being made "*maître de conférences*" in 1881. During the summer vacation of 1875 he visited 60 libraries in Spain and examined 450 MSS. The general results of this mission are summed up in the *Archives des missions*, 3d series, Vol. I, pp. 111-163. During the vacation of 1876 he executed a similar mission to Denmark and Sweden, the immediate result of which was an article of 104 pages in the *Arch. des Miss.* VI 2, in which he described 100 MSS. of the Royal Library of Copenhagen, with an appendix describing 30 MSS. belonging to the university of that city.

On his return he was made assistant librarian of the *Bibliothèque de l'Université*. In 1881 he became librarian. Here his services were invaluable, and the library was greatly improved. His faculty for organisation had already been displayed when he was a pupil of the *École des Hautes Études*, at which time a society was formed among the members of the *conférences*, where his services were so indispensable that when he was forced to withdraw by pressure of labor, the society soon ceased to exist.

In 1877 Tournier revived the *Revue de Philologie* (founded by L. Renier in 1845, but soon discontinued), and L. Havet undertook the Latin department. They conceived the idea of annexing to their periodical a *Revue des Revues*, in which should be published *résumés* of all articles of scientific value relating to classical philology that were to be found in journals of a high grade in any part of the world, amounting annually to about 80,000 pages to be epitomized. There seemed to be but one man capable of organizing the work, and that man was Charles Graux, then twenty-four years of age. He had to prepare a list of the journals to be reviewed, find co-laborers at home and "general editors" in foreign countries competent to review and to select assistants, and (what was probably the most difficult task of all) he had to see that the work was done in time and done properly. It may be added that he had to examine all the manuscript reports and prepare them for the press, correcting the style, abbreviating, etc.; and this he did with such care that a misspelled name, even of a foreigner, rarely escaped his eye. For the first volume he himself epitomized

mized 45 volumes of reviews. He was at the same time secretary of the *Revue de Philologie*, corresponded with contributors, and corrected proofs. Besides, he contributed many valuable articles of his own, including critical editions of several works that had never before been published. These articles amounted to more than 300 pages in five years.

In the vacation of 1879 he again visited Spain to collate and photograph various MSS., and in the Easter holidays (1880) he went once more to that country to complete his task. Some of the results he embodied in his Doctor Dissertation: "*Étude sur les origines du fonds grec de l'Escorial*," a work of 662 pages.

In 1879 he resigned the chief editorship of the *Revue des Revues* and undertook the classical department of the *Revue Critique*, to which he had already contributed several important articles, and here again his services were of the highest value. Up to his death he had himself contributed 60 valuable articles to this review.

Having received the degree of *Docteur ès Lettres* (Jan. 11, 1881), he was made *maître de conférences à la Faculté des Lettres*, and held two conferences (something like the German seminaries) per week, but still continued his duties at the *École des Hautes Études* and at the library.

In August, 1881, he went to Italy and searched the libraries of Venice, Milan, Florence, Rome, extending his excursion to Naples, Pompeii, Paestum. He found many uncollated MSS., and many more which had been used to little advantage. He collected material for a new article on Stichometry, a subject to which he had already made a very important contribution. His leave of absence was extended that he might comply with a request to examine and classify the 451 Greek MSS. (Palatine) of the Vatican, of which they were preparing a catalogue; and he worked at this task with a feverish ardor which may have contributed to his fatal malady. He returned Dec. 23 to Paris, assisted at a doctor examination the 26th, went home to visit his relatives, returned the 31st, and on the 6th of January, 1882, he was prevented from resuming his university labors by an indisposition which rapidly developed into a malarial fever against which all the resources of science were unavailing. On the 13th he passed away at the age of twenty-nine.

In addition to the works already mentioned, Graux had published an edition of the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon, and of Plutarch's *Life of Demosthenes*, to which he was soon to add the *Life of Cicero*. He had also contributed two articles to Saglio's *Classical Dictionary*, and had published a treatise of 33 pages on the fortifications of Carthage at the time of the third Punic war. He had undertaken a large edition of Xenophon, and had many other works nearly or quite ready for the press. [It should be remembered that Graux did no rehashing; he went to the very foundation of things, and made valuable contributions to every subject he touched.] He intended to publish a general treatise on Greek Palaeography, a subject which he had declared and shown to be in its infancy. Posthumous works will appear in the course of time.

From 1877 he was an officer of the Academy, and in 1879 was made a member of the commission for examining classic text-books for schools and colleges.

Graux was affable and obliging, and was often consulted by scholars of foreign lands as to the MSS. in France, Spain, and Denmark. In this way he became the virtual author of many anonymous works.

A volume of miscellaneous philological articles, contributed by his friends in every part of the world, is soon to be published and dedicated *to the memory of Charles Graux*.

12. The last page of this number begins with these impressive words: Au moment où la première livraison de notre *Revue* allait paraître, nous avons été cruellement frappés. Les obsèques de Charles Graux n'étaient pas encore terminées que nous avions la douleur de perdre un collaborateur, notre ancien maître, dont les conseils éclairés et la direction amicale étaient pour nous d'un prix inappréciable. Charles THUROT est mort subitement le 17 Janvier, 1882, dans sa cinquante-neuvième année." Thurot had taken the place of Tournier as one of the editors. The next number will contain a detailed notice of him, which will be reported for this Journal.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ROMANIA.¹

No. 36.

Inventaire des Manuscrits en Langue Française possédés par Francesco Gonzaga I, Capitaine de Mantoue, mort en 1407. By Braghirolli, Meyer and Paris. At the end of the XIVth century the illustrious family of the Gonzagas of Mantua had gathered around them a fine collection of works of art and books, as is shown by numerous inventories still extant. One of the most important of these inventories is that made by the trustees at the death of Francesco Gonzaga in 1407, "poichè in esso, insieme con molte altre cose di pregio, sono descritti i codici latini, italiani e francesi, che costituirono la biblioteca di quel principe." This library consisted of about 400 volumes in manuscript. These books and others of the Gonzagas were sold at Venice in 1708 at the death of the Duke of Mantua, Ferdinand-Charles IV. A great number of them was purchased by J.-B. Recanati (†1734), who left by will his manuscripts, to the number of 200, to the republic of Venice. Others became a part of the Abbé Canonici's collection, which was acquired by the Bodleian Library in 1817. It is thus that the only complete MS. of the great epic of the south of France, *Girart de Roussillon*, is now at Oxford. The list here published of the French and Provençal MSS. of the Gonzaga collection is the fellow to that of the MSS. owned by the Este family, which was published by Rajna in Romania II, p. 49. Both show the great esteem in which French literature was held at Mantua and Ferrara in the XIVth century. The list numbers 67.

Sur un épisode d'Aimeri de Narbonne. By G. Paris. In the song of Aimeri de Narbonne there is a famous episode, which relates that Aimeri, wishing to marry, sent some of his knights to ask the hand of Hermenjart, daughter of Désier, king of the Lombards. Arrived at Pavia, the king invites them to eat at his table, but they refuse, saying they are rich enough to pay their own way. The king then issues an order to the townspeople to charge the strangers exorbitant prices for everything. This does not prevent them from buying a

¹ See Amer. Jour. of Phil., Vol. II, p. 261.

large quantity of provisions, whereupon the king utters another order that no wood shall be sold them at any price. The Frenchmen, however, are equal to the emergency and buy up all the nuts and wooden vessels (*noix et hanaps de madre*) which are brought them. Using these as fuel they serve a splendid repast and invite all to partake who wish. Then admitted to the palace, for want of seats they fold up their rich cloaks and sit upon them. On departing they leave their cloaks in the hall; and when the king sends messengers to tell them they had forgotten their cloaks, they return the answer that they are not in the habit of carrying their seats about with them.—This passage of the *Aimeri Fauriel* cites in proof of his theory of the southern (*méridionale*) origin of the *chansons de geste* in general and of *Aimeri de Narbonne* in particular. "Ces luttes de fierté," he says, "d'orgueil et d'ostentation de magnificence" were characteristic of Provençal manners. This same episode was invoked by the eminent historian, Dozy of Leyden, to show the Norman origin not only of *Aimeri* but also of the Narbonne cycle in general. Léon Gautier opposes Dozy in his "Epopées françaises" (vol. III, 216). Gaston Paris examines very thoroughly, in the present article, all the evidence, and concludes that there is nothing to justify Fauriel's conclusion; that Dozy's would be much more probable; but he himself is of the opinion that the story of *Aimeri* is neither French nor Provençal, but borrowed by them from some of their adjacent neighbors. The remarkable statement, *Les Normands, en fait d'épopée n'ont rien créé, mais ils ont facilement accueilli ce qu'avaient créé leurs voisins du sud et de l'est*, surely calls for something more than the mere assertion.

Un mariage dans le Haut-Forez. By Victor Smith. This is a lively and entertaining account of the marriage ceremonies which obtain in the neighborhood of Velay and Vivarais, together with the songs and metrical formulas used on such occasions. These songs, though violating the laws of French versification in nearly every line, though lacking the sanction of a more refined state of society, breathe a freshness and melody which we seek in vain in much of the stilted twaddle that we are asked to admire as poetry in contemporary French literature. The article can not be summarized.

Mélanges. Ulrich proposes *de-ex-ripare* as derivation of *desver*, and Joret, *pultus, pultura* for *poutare*. J. Cornu gives a collection of examples from the *Demanda do Santa Graal* and other sources, to show that the Portuguese particle *er, ar*, regarded by Diez as identical with Provençal *ar, er* (from *ora*), is the Latin prefix *re* become separated.

Comptes-rendus. An exhaustive criticism is given by G. Paris of Hugo Andresen's edition of Wace's *Roman de Rou et des ducs de Normandie*. Much praise is bestowed upon Andresen's work, only his critical method is pronounced "l'idéal de la confusion."

The *Périodiques* and *Chronique* complete the 9th volume of the *Romania*.

Nos. 37 and 38.

Una versione in ottava rima del libro dei *Sette Savi*. Pio Rajna published the first notice of this important MS. in *Romania* VII, 23-51, where he seeks to establish its outward history, or in other words, the general group of versions to which it belongs and its geographical position. In the first place it forms the middle part of a codex containing two other

episodes (*Appollonio di Tiro et Puzella Gaia*), covers 124 folios, and is composed of 23 *canti*. These are distributed into 706 stanzas, all of which are in the regular *ottava rima*. The date of composition is put down for about the middle of the XVth century (1420-1470 are assigned as limits), and until recently belonged to the Seibante library of Verona. The title given it in the collection just named is *Storia di Stefano*, though the contents show that it belongs to the cyclus of the *Septem Sapientes*, with reference to which Italy alone seemed to form an exception to other European countries, in that she possessed no rimed version of this story. France, Spain, Germany and England each had one, but up to the discovery of this document only prose versions were known to belong to the Peninsula.

We have to do here with a copy made in the Eastern Venetian Dialect territory. The rimer himself is a Venetian, and gives us all the *idiomatic* peculiarities, whether phonetic, morphological or lexicographical, of his native dialect. Alongside of these, however, Rajna finds numerous Tuscan forms, and, after a careful comparison of the Tuscan and Venetian dialect elements, comes to the conclusion that the author wished to write in Italian proper, but, with his imperfect knowledge of it, constantly fell back into his old dialect usages. This peculiar language mixture (*tosco-dialettale*) sprang up in North Italy in the second half of the XIIIth century, and became very popular with the patriotic literati in opposition to those who used the *Franco-dialettale* species, *i. e.* a mixture of langue d'oïl with the special Italian dialect.

In his second article (Romania VII, 369-406) Mr. R. attempts to show us the inner history of the MS., *i. e.* its relation to the different members of the Italian groups. Accepting Mussafia's terminology (*versio Italica*) for this set, he finds that to the five prose versions which originally composed it, this *versione rimata* must be added. Two of these five (designated by the letters *m*, *c*) are simple translations of the Latin (marked *l*), but the relation of *r* (*rimate*) to *l* is more difficult to determine.

Two hypotheses are suggested with reference to them: (1) *l*, *r*, both come independently from the same stock; (2) *r* came from *l*, but was corrupted by the aid of another outside version.

Of these suppositions R. thinks that, though the first is the simpler, it is more difficult to establish than the second. In no possible case can the direct sources of *r* be found in *l*, and between them we must always suppose some popular manipulation of the subject (*volgarizzamento*). But which, now, shall this be, *m* or *c*? Not *m*, because of the great discrepancies between it and the others, both in age and in the presentation of the subject-matter. With reference to *c*, as the intercalated member, numerous arguments are cited for and against it, and the question is left unsettled in the hope that future discovery of some MS. may throw new light upon it.

So far as the genealogy of the *versio Italica* is concerned, it is suggested that possibly it may be a sort of middle term between the European groups on the one hand and the Oriental on the other. This is rendered likely from the intimate relations which Venice held at this time with Constantinople and the East generally.

Of the different members of the *versio Italica*, *m* is Venetian, *r* do., *l* belongs to the region of the Po, *c* was produced by a Tuscan residing also in this region,

while *em es* (the remaining members of the group) are due to Venetian and Lombard authors.

At the close of this paper R. discusses the relations of the various European centres of this episode, and observes that in the Italian group we have a new case of a literary fact which up to this time has been observed only in chivalric subject-matter, viz. just as the *chanson de geste* produced in the region of the Po new families entirely distinct from the corresponding development on the other side of the Alps, so with the episode of the *sette savi*, which is not perpetuated by simple reproduction, but gives rise here to a new species.

Phonétique française. By G. Paris. For several years scholars have been expressing their dissatisfaction at Diez's treatment of the Romanic vowel system. Much that the master wrote was necessarily tentative, and will not now stand the test of criticism. With the exception of Boehmer's article on the vowel *o/u* (Rom. Stud. III, 597-602), the discontent has been expressed in hints and allusions rather than systematic criticism. Mr. Paris, taking Diez as a starting point, proposes to give a thorough revision of the French vowels, confining himself in the present article to the narrow *o* (*o fermé*). Rejecting Diez's division of 1st tonics and atonics, and 2d tonics long, short and in position, he speaks of 1st, *voyelles toniques ou atones*; 2d, of *voyelles libres ou entravées*. By *voyelle libre* he means when it is final, followed by a vowel, by a single consonant, or the groups *pr, br, tr, dr*; a *voyelle entravée* is followed by two consonants other than those mentioned. Special cases are made of *cr, gr, pl, bl*, and where *j* (yot) is combined with a consonant. Translating *libre* by *free*, and *entravée* by *bound*, his division of the vowels would be:

1st. Tonics	{	short	{ free.	2d. Atonics	{	short	{ free.
			bound.				bound.
	{	long	{ free.		{	long	{ free.
			bound.				bound.

He formulates thus the rule for the Romanic narrow *o* (=Latin *ō* and *ū*): 1st, *o* tonic free, whether it comes from classic *ō* or *ū*, becomes in French *eu*; ex. *fleur, gueule*; 2d, *o* tonic bound gives *ou*; ex. *tour, goutte*. He then proceeds to discuss these two classes in detail.

La Chirurgie de Roger de Parme en vers Provençaux. By Antoine Thomas. This is a notice and discussion of a MS. of the Library of Bologna, containing a metrical translation of the *Practica Chirurgicae* of Roger of Parma. The author thinks that the publication of this medical treatise must be put considerably earlier than the usually accepted date, 1230. In 1859 Puccinotti, in his *Storia della Medicina*, proposed 1180; Thomas thinks this is not too early, as he shows that the Provençal version was made between 1168 and 1209, probably about 1200. A contemporary of Roger, Raymond Amiller, himself a physician, executed the translation. The translator adds a preamble of his own, with comments of the text. He confines himself likewise to the first three books of the *Practica*, omitting the fourth. Some extracts from the poem are given.

Études sur le Poème du Cid. By J. Cornu. These studies are mostly etymological, and are not of a sufficiently general interest to call for reproduction here.

Contribuições para um Romanceiro e Cancioneiro popular Portuguez. By Z. Consiglieri Pedroso. The Portuguese, like many others of the European nations, have not been slow to appreciate the value of their popular songs and traditions; and while they have no folk-lore society, as far as I know, there have not been wanting vigorous workers in this most interesting field. Among the most ardent of these are Adolpho Coelho, *Romances populares e rimas infantis portuguezas* (Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil. III, and Romania III 263), and Pedroso, who has already published six numbers of a work entitled *Contribuições para uma mythologia popular portugueza*. His present article is a short exposé of his studies in folk-lore, of which he makes three great divisions (tres grandes capitulos). Of these he speaks as follows: O primeiro occupa-se especialmente do maravilhoso popular, dos restos e vestígios da mythologia do povo que ainda se conservam na tradição oral, das superstições, crenças, prejuízos, etc., que a esse maravilhoso se referem. O segundo trata dos contos populares. O terceiro, que começamos com a presente publicação, refere-se aos romances, aos cantos, orações, jogos infantis, etc., aos elementos enfim, que devem constituir o nosso romanceiro e cancionero popular. He gives twelve or fifteen pages of specimens from his collection, which is extensive and has been made by himself, wife and mother, assisted by Senhora D. Elvira de Macedo Damasio.

Contes populaires lorrains recueillis dans un village du Barrois à Montiers-sur-Saulx (Meuse). By Emmanuel Cosquin. Continued from Romania No. XXXV. (See Am. Jour. of Phil., Vol. I, p. 507).

Chants populaires du Velay et du Forez. By Victor Smith. The reader will find here fifteen "complaintes criminelles," which tell of divers crimes. Some of these crimes, on account of their naive cruelty and the marvellous attaching to them, have a legendary character; others again represent more real circumstances, and seem to point to determinate facts, which must have made a profound and durable impression upon the popular mind.

The *Mélanges* contains among other things: A Letter from A. d'Ancona to G. Paris on the Wandering Jew in Italy in the XIIIth Century; De l'influence régressive de l' *i* atone sur les voyelles toniques (see Romania VII, 360), by J. Cornu; Une épître française de Saint Etienne copiée en languedoc au XIII siècle, ed. by G. Paris; Mélanges catalans: I, Plainte de la Vierge; II, Du MS. Douce 162 et de la prédiction de Vincent de Ferrer en France, by P. Meyer; Deux manuscrits de Gonzague, and Sur un prétendu fragment inédit de Desclot, by Alfred Morel-Fatio; Notes sur la langue des *Farsas y églogas* de Lucas Fernandez; A stanza from a *ronde bretonne* (Le Prisonnier de Rennes), here given, will show that the expression "hoop la," so frequently heard on our streets, was not imported from the Celestial Empire, as is generally supposed. It is:

Dans la ville de Rennes,
Houpp' la la la, houp' la,
Dans la ville de Rennes
Il ya-t'un prisonnier.

Jacob Stürzinger proposes a long list of corrections to the Sacrifice d'Abraham, ed. by Ulrich in Romania VIII, 374.

Comptes-rendus. The following important publications are noticed: Untersuchung über die Chronique ascendante und ihren verfassers, H. Hormel, Marburg, 1880; Betontes $\acute{e} + i$ und $\delta + i$ in der normannischen Mundart, P. Schulzke, Halle, 1879; Guilhem Figueira, ein provenzalischer Troubadour, Emil Levy, Berlin, 1880; Leben und Werke des Troubadours Ponz de Capduoill, Max von Napsolski, Halle, 1880; La légende d'Œdipe, étudiée dans l'antiquité, au moyen âge et dans les temps modernes, en particulier dans le Roman de Thèbes, texte français du XII siècle, par L. Constans, Paris, 1880; Recull de eximplis e miracles, gestes e faules e altres legendes ordenades per A. B. C., tretes de un manuscrit en pergami del començament del segle XV, ara per primera volta estampades (Barcelona, 1881); Nouveau recueil de farces française des XV et XVI siècles, par Emile Picot et Christophe Nyrop, Paris, 1880; Faune populaire de la France, par Eugène Rolland, 3 vols—Vol. I, Les mammifères sauvages, noms vulgaires, dictons, proverbes, légendes, contes et superstitions; II, Les oiseaux sauvages; III, Les reptiles, les poissons, les mollusques, les crustacés, et les insectes—Paris, 1877-81. There will be two more volumes of this great and important work, which will be devoted to domestic animals.

The *Chronique* gives a short notice of the death of Gaston Paris's father, Paulin Paris, which took place at Paris, February 13, 1881. The deceased has been a recognized authority for the last fifty years in the literature (especially French) of the Middle Ages. A review of his life and work is promised for a future number of the *Romania*.

The premature death of the young Romanic scholar, Henry Nicol, is likewise chronicled, a much finer appreciation being shown of the value of his work than any accorded him by his countrymen at the time of his decease (January 30, 1881). He was but thirty-six years old when he died, and the talent displayed in the work he had already done caused great expectations to be entertained of him. His death leaves England without a representative of Romance philology.

SAMUEL GARNER.